

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/789,603	GERY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dan Washburn	2628	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Dan Washburn.

(3) _____.

(2) D. Kent Stier.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2006

Time: 3:30 pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

Claims 1,2, 4-8 and 14-19

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Washburn called Attorney Stier regarding the identical scope of claims 1, 2, and 4-8 when compared against claims 14-19. Examiner Washburn also proposed amending some unclear language in claim 1. Attorney Stier agreed that claims 1,2, and 4-8 were substantially identical in scope to claims 14-19 and proposed cancelling claim 2 in order to remedy the problem. Attorney Stier also agreed to amending claim 1 to clarify the language used.